P.F. 137 793.

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1893-94
~~192~~ .
(L.R.)

File No 12/793.

Serial Nos 1 to 7

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos. 1 to

M. ~~Part~~ B for March. 1895.

SUBJECT.

Respt regarding the Kandyan & certain Jaffna lands of Karainar Range of the Paranagere talik.

W D 2233-4/95-20,000 8-20

A. no. 10 of 1893-94

Appellant — Rajamundra Dom.

Respondent — Sadhu Dom.

The appellant prefers an appeal against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Sibsagar, in connection with the payment of the land revenue assessed upon lands in the Haridhan Range of the Dangore Tahsil.

Sadhu Dom and Rajamundra Dom who are paying into the Sadiya Treasury the Tahsil office of Dangore, Land bearing survey numbers 63-76, 82, 86, 87, 88 and 89 of the above village originally contained in Patel Gaon Bari but were subsequently added under the Thengi rules to Gaon Bari which formed the Tahsil assessment. The total assessment was Rs. 63-8- after

After deducting one Anna, as Rs 131-4 - the fixed rate for Jodi payable by the Ryots of the Land, 83, the Jodi was received between themselves as shown below (the arrangement was finally as)

Subadar.

S.no.	acres	Jodi assessment		Jodi	Anna
63.	21. 26	25-as	41-	Rs 68-	15-8
76	14- 14.		25-		
82.	8. 2.		10. 8		
86.	7- 17.		7-		
4.	51. 19		83. 8		

Rajamundram-

S.no.	acres	Jodi assessment		Jodi	Anna
65.	27. 33.	50.		2 as 63-4	16-12
84.	8. 32.	6.			
85.	19- 14.	26			
3.	55. 39	80			

32-4

131-4

The Jodi or Anna was not apportioned on each land but it was collected as Simple Sadaram was paying the portion of the Jodi and Rajamundram, Kirnee portion, Rs 1332. 80. Rajamundram Ryot, relinquished S.no. 65. Jowar had taken it this year, Accordingly the Rate this existing rate, the assessment Rs 50/- was deducted from the amount of Jodi payable by Rajamundram and

83-8

53-8
67-4
16-12

163-12
131-4
32-4

26
13-12
12-4

26
13-12
12-4

131-4
67-12
63-12

86
63-12
14-4

3

Gattalam

Jodi	Aafa
57-12	16-4

Rajhamundalam

Jodi	Aafa
13-12	16-4

83-5	50	80
67-14	26	63-4
15-7-4		16-12

63
76

Gattalam

67|4

Rajhamundalam

15|12

20-4-92

said the remaining Annuitants 12-4- need not be paid up this Sa 1884, the family Received the Jodi and Aafa as Per margin Sa 1891 the Appointment of Jodi was made in all the Cases in Proportion to the Assessment thereof Specially to the instructions contained in Para 3 of Remarks for preparation of Statement Form No 1 Appendix A. In the event there has been an increase in the Jodi payable on account of the Cases the Appointment of Rajhamundalam

Sero	asst.	Jodi	Aafa
63.	41	29-4.	11-12.
76.	25.	18-.	7-.
82.	10-8.	7-8.	3-.
86	7-.	5-.	2-.
Total 4.	83-8	59-12	23-12.

S.No	asst.	Jodi	Aafa
84	6.	4-4	1-12
85.	24.	17-.	7-.
Total 2.	30	21-4	8-12

Since the Jaita of these Cases stand in the name of Gattalam the Annuitant of Damarla Bhaskara a native of Gattalam demanding Rs 1-13-4 as the arrears of Remuneration for 7-8. due on the

5

on which the arrear was due were in the enjoyment of Raghavendra Rao, the amount should be recovered from him —

Raghavendra Rao also preferred a petition to the Amildar complaining that the jodi he was wrongly apportioned, as the amount he was paying (13-12-) was not distributed on the lands in his possession, that in the partdeed executed in 1889, it was decided that each party should enjoy half the Rasa allowed by Government on the jodi lands and that he was not liable to pay the amount as the amount he was hitherto paying had already been paid.

But the Amildar gave him an endorsement to the effect that the amount should be paid by him and that in default, the crops on the lands (no 84 & 85) would be attached

22.9.92

Rajharendra Row then addressed a 6

petition to the Deputy Commissioner 5-10-92.

requesting to set aside the order

of the ~~Deputy~~ Amildar

as their agreement was based on a

registered document.

The Deputy Commissioner referred

the petition to the Amildar for 25-10-92.

report.

The Deputy Amildar replied.

" A jodi of Rs 59-12-- has been

fixed on the lands in the enjoyment of Subba Row

and Rs 21-4-- on the lands in the possession

of Rajharendra Row. Subba Row

has paid his full share of jodi and

Rajharendra Row Rs 15-4-- only and

refuses to pay the remaining sum 7-8-(with hoodlees)

Since every person should pay jodi on

the lands in his enjoyment in proportion

to the assessment thereof, the amount

Rs 7-8-- should be paid by Rajharendra Row

as per Sec. 42. para 12 of the L.R.C.

Rajharendra Row has been enjoying

lands whose assessment is Rs 30/-

and

for the year 1891-92.

Also the following items received at Laidlaw, the total for the month was less by £2-2- than the corresponding month last year.

Nov. Later the Sales on this account were £2-2- less, owing to the shipments of Raghavendra Rao, not yet taken delivery of £23-2- less by corresponding month last year, £7-8- should be received from Raghavendra Rao.

Mr Smith also stated that the total sales for the month of July 1892 were £5.7.92.

"The following accounts have come in this day." 27.7.92.

Mr Laid. " His account is not due by me, I have paid the amount to Krishna Iyengar, the first week of June, Rs 13-12-, about time from which date I have ceased to buy cigarettes"

Laidlaw addressed letter to Mr 21.7.92.

Smith asking that he may pay the amount due by him according to agreement between 1891-92, and that Mr Smith

m

8-12-92.

23-3-93

said it is nothing but reasonable
that he should receive extraordinary
amount of Legal aid from a
professional Gentleman like Mr Rajharendra
Coomar Roy the amount after
the notice was served on him the
Auditor of Domingee Settlement
the allowance to be taken into Cons.

The Deputy Commissioner observed -

It appears that Mr Roy has been
regularly instructed for Respdt
Kanai & that any receipt issued
by him that Rajharendra Roy has
been paying a sum of Rs 13-12-0 only
of Rajharendra Roy has been paying
Rs 13-12- and Saiba Ram Rs 67-4-
the Pleader has no authority to
appear the Respdt & no proportion
of the assessment of the Lands.

The Deputy Auditor reported
as follows

The apportionment of the Land
made by the Pleader according to
direction contained in para 3 -
remarks of Statement was opposed

1 godi of his lands.

The Deputy Commissioner ordered

"Each land is primarily liable for
"the assessment leviable thereon.
"The Government has nothing to
15.5.93 "do with the family arrangement
"Relied on by Raghavendra Row
"He is a co-sharer and two of the
"lands are in his possession. Those
"lands are unalienable and cannot
"consequently be sold. But their
"crop is liable to be distrained and
"sold. The co-sharer and his property
"are also liable. If the arrear can
"not be recovered from the co-sharer
"and from his property including
"the crop of the lands in question,
"the Khatedar and his property
"would be liable to be proceeded
"against. Ordered accordingly.

Raghavendra accordingly pais
the arrears. He now prefers
an appeal against the

above order of the Deputy Commissioner

The grounds of appeal are
in English as also the D.C's
Commr's order.

Nil

Submitted for orders.
R. 1/2

Posted to 29th March 18

Adjourned to 26th April
Do — to 17th May

Rajkumar Ram was directed to pay the amount thus fixed upon the field at his assessment. Rajkumar Ram now contends that according to the previous agreement he was to pay a fixed of Rs 13-12-0 only and not Rs 21-4-0 as per the account prepared. Sukhia Ram contends that the partition was effected in Kharif 1880, that the fixed and rate were not apportioned on each land, and that since the fixed and rate have been fixed on each land for the Government, each party owned pay the amount assigned on the land at his assessment. Subsequently contention seems to be reasonable, since the fixed has been fixed by Government after the partition, it is reasonable that each party should pay the

fixed

(General Serial No. 3..)

189..

No. 216

Name of Petitioner.

Village.

Taluk.

District.

Date of Arz.

Date of Receipt. 24.7.93.

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures.

ABSTRACT.

Pet 274 of 93 per Received 17/8/93

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE;

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

(3)

The accompanying Petition No. 274

dated 24th July 93 received at the Dewan's Office from Sankara Rajaramaiah Row, Rajaram Gymnasta Kolakere Taluk, appealing against the Chitaldrug Deputy Commissioner's order ~~passed~~ on a dispute between the Petitioner and ~~the~~ another ~~petitioner~~ of ~~encroachment~~ land is forwarded, together with its enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner Chitaldrug District for submission of proceedings with a report on the facts of the case and on the points urged in the petition

2. The petition with the enclosures should be returned

By Order,

Draft

Chief Secretary.

Bangalore, 19 August 1893.

M. G. C. P. Bangalore.—21-11-92—3,000.

14/8.

From the Asst to 17/8/93-9-93.
148

(General Serial No. 30.)

315-3

1893 .94.

Pet 541

From The Officiating Private Secretary to His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

To

The Chief Secretary to the ~~Dewan~~ Government of Mysore.

Dated 2d
Despatched } September 1893.
Received

Enclosures No. Petition from

General No. 174.
No. 145

In reply to Endorsement No. P. 274. dated 30th August 1893.

SUBJECT.

Forwarding a petition of Rajakaryam Boy Nagappa Chetty praying for the withdrawal of the order passed by the Deputy Commissioner in connection with the removal of his name from the Register of Pawn Brokers.

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

L. R. 121-93-3

B

Petition Received

No. 174.
" 148.
Encl: 2 with Receipt
Returned.
J.O.

Deputy Commissr's Office
Chitaldrug District
dated 2d Septr 1893.

(4)

The Chief Secretary,
to the Govt of
Mysore

Sir,

With reference to your Official Memorandum No. Pet 274 dated 6th ultimo forwarding for report a petition from Raghavendra Rao, Nagadi Gumasta of the Holalkere Taluk appealing against the order passed by me in connection with the payment of the Jodi of certain Service Inam lands in the Hariharpur Range of the Davanagere Taluk, I have the honor to submit the entire record and to state that the English Memo attached to the

Enclosures returned.
Not rec'd
Rec'd 7/9/93.

record

record, and the order passed by me in English contain the full particulars of the case in dispute

2. Sobat Rao is the Khatédar of all the lands enjoyed by himself and by the petitioner Raghavendra Rao. The apportionment of the Jodi was made according to the assessment of each land, agreeably to the instructions contained in para 3 of remarks in statement No 1 appendix A. and the petitioner was directed to pay the amount thus fixed upon the fields in his enjoyment—

3. Under para 12 of Rule 41 of the Revenue Rules, the person in possession and enjoyment is in the first instance liable, whether he is the registered holder or not. The Khatédar becomes liable if the money could not

be

be recovered from the present possession. This is precisely the order that I have made & from which the Petitioner has appealed.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obed. Svt

Chas. Swaney
Deputy Commissioner
Building &

a

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REG'D. No. 216 R
DATE 24-7-93

COURT FEE
TWO RUPEES

To
The Honorable Sir K. Seshadri Iyer, Esquire
K.C.S.I.
Dewan Bahadur
&c. &c. &c. The Minister to
His Highness the Maharaja of
Mysore.

Most Respectfully Sir

A.S. No. 110
93-94

The humble Petition of
Chikka Ranganathan, the undersigned, Sunkada
Rajharenaikan, against the decision
passed by the Deputy Commissioner of
Chitradurg District, in the right
No 392 of 29-4-93 of Tarikere Sub Magis
-trate.

Subject matter

(1) Whether the Minister of
Rajharenaikan are to enjoy
for the said dues of Patil Inam in
Rajanahalli Village, Tarikere Taluk
the alone Patil dues in the Hobli
of Subbi Rau, now in the enjoyment
as follows viz. 53-8.

I

Subbi Rau Hobli

Survey No.	Area	Assessment Rs as p	Total	Vaja
63	21-26	41-0-0		
76	14-14	25-0-0	68-0-0	15-8-0
82 (part)	8-2	10-8-0		
86 (part)	7-17	7-0-0		
Total	51-19	83-8-0	68-0-0	15-8-0

II

Rajharenaikan

S. No.	Area	Assessment	Total
65	27.33	50-0-0	
84 (part)	8.32	16-0-0	63-4-0
85 (part)	19-14	24-0-0	
Total	55.39	50-0-0	63-4-0
		Vaja	16-12-0

19

the 29th Sept 1889.

(5) In 1891-92 in preparing the accounts according to the form of Appendix Khalawar no. 1 of the Land Revenue Rules, the total jude 81 Rs has been wrongly distributed in proportion to the total assessment, on all the lands in the Khata of SubbaRow.

(6) This ought to have been properly distributed thus:— SubbaRow's jude 67-4-0 Rs should have been distributed in proportion to the lands in his possession + RaghavendraRow's Jude 13-12-0 Rs in proportion to the lands in his possession.

(7) RaghavendraRow begs to state, that, by the above wrong distribution, Subba Row's jude was lessened by 7-4-0 Rs as & that amount was increased his Jude.

So a notice was served on him by the amildar to pay off the excess jude viz 7-4-0 Rs. But he declined to pay the excess on the ground, that he has already paid what he was hitherto paying according to their family arrangement and showed the Registered Bond to the Taluk amildar & further requested the Deputy Commissioner through the amildar to issue orders for the distribution of each partiener's Jude in proportion to the lands in his possession & to recover each parteners Jude

as

as usual

(8) But to the amildar's report No 392 of 29-4-93 the Deputy commissioner passed the following orders.

(1) That each land is primarily liable for the assessment leviable there on.

(2) The Government has nothing to do with the family arrangement &c & proper steps should be taken to recover the arrear according to the Revenue Rules

(9) The poor petitioner was forced to pay off the excess Jude.

(10) The petitioner begs to state that the Deputy commissioner, according to para 10 Section 41 of the Land Revenue Rules, should have considered, their family arrangement, (signed by the two parteners & duly registered in obedience to the Registration Rules); and issued issued orders for the payment of Jude accordingly

(11) The petitioner thinks that the order passed by the Deputy commissioner is contrary to the existing Rules, and therefore humbly begs in conclusion, to state, that your highness will be good enough to bring his humble Case into your honors generous consideration and thereby do the favor of accomplishing his

	No. of Lands	area	assessment	Jodi	Nayi
G. Total	7	107.18	163-8-0	131-4	32-4-0

(2) In 1884-85 the land No. 5 assessed at Rs 5 which had fallen to the share of Rajhavendra Rao was relinquished.

After the relinquishment of the above land, the lands that remained in possession of each are as follows.—

	No. of Lands	area	assessment	Jodi	Nayi
I	4	51.19	Rs 83-8-0	Rs 68-0-0	Rs 15-8-0

in possession of Subba Rao.

II	2	28.6	Rs 30-0-0	Rs 13-4-0	Rs 16-12-0

in possession of Rajhavendra Rao

(3) In 1885-86 there was a further reduction of 4 annas in the Jodi & therefore the total Jodi was reduced to 81 Rs. Out of 81 Rs Jodi, Subba Rao was paying Rs 67-4-0 & Rajhavendra Rao Rs 13-12-0 Jodi to the Government, & out of Rs 32-8-0 Nayi, each was enjoying exactly half. This continued till 1890-91.

(4). In 1891-92 a deed has been executed by the above two parties to have equal shares in future, both the Government grants, & debts, & Jodi to the Government as stated in para (3) The same deed has been registered in Sub Registrar's office at Davangere on the

His humble requestic to issue orders kindly for the recovery of Jinis according to their family arrangement.

For which act of kindness, the humble petitioner Rajendra Rao, as in duty bound shall ever pray for your long life and prosperity.

Begging to be excused for intrusion.

The petitioner begs to remain

Your honor's most obedient & humble servant

Holalkere
9th July 1903

The copy of the order of the Dy. Commr. of Chitaldrog Dist. is here in enclosed for your honor's kind consideration

Address:-

S. Rajendra Rao
Nagadi Gumasta
Holalkere
Chitaldrog Dist.

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore.

6

Petition ~~Appeal~~ No. 10 of 1893-94

Appellant.	Vs.	Respondent.
Rajaramachar Rao of Hullihalli, Hullihalli District		Subba Rau represented by his Adhikari Ananda Rau

L. R. 121-93-4

Decision. 6/19-5-94

Appellant and Respondent [illegible] Patel [illegible] Jaina Devi Jungaji Jadi [illegible] to a Settlement made [illegible] Police as shown below.

Respondent

Jaina [illegible]	[illegible]	Respondent Jadi	Rayji
63 - 21 - 16		41 - 4 - 4	
76 - 14 - 14		25 - 4 - 4	67-4-4
82 - 8 - 2		10 - 8 - 4	16-4-4
86 - 7 - 17		7 - 4 - 4	
51 - 9		83 - 8 - 4	

Appellant

65 - 27 - 33		50 - 4 - 4	
84 - 8 - 32		6 - 4 - 4	63-12-4
85 - 19 - 14		24 - 4 - 4	16-4-4
55 - 39		80 - 4 - 4	
Deducted from [illegible]	27 - 35	50 - 4 - 4	50-4-4
Balance	28 - 6	30 - 4 - 4	13-12-4

Bail in respect of Rights in 1871-72 under the Encumbered Estates Act 1849 and the Land Clauses Act

	acres	exempt	fcp
Respondent	57	8	8	59	12	4
Appellant	25	6	30	0	0	21	0	0

The Appellant who had made the assignment to him sought for, had understood and expected that

Government would not be responsible for the Expenses application of the Revenue Rules. It was not the intention of the Rules to prevent the Landlord, voluntarily to assert the Rights they had by Law or the Court Leases and Rules by Law. In this case, the Land Commissioners, the Judge and Appellant and Respondent respectively waived the application of the Land Rules by Law. The Commissioners requested to have

Mit Respekt über alles Klagen und Begehren des Herrn Jos. Anton Franz Appellat, und Antwort des Herrn Respondent.

Summa	Respondent	Appellat
63 – 21 – 26	41 – a – a	22 – a – 3
76 – 14 – 14	25 – a – a	20 – 2 – 2
82 – 8 – 2	10 – 8 – a	8 – 7 – 4
86 – 7 – 17	7 – a – a	5 – 10 – 3
57 – 19	83 – 8 – a	67 – 4 – a

Summa	Appellat	
84 – 8 – 32	6 – a – a	2 – 12 – a
85 – 19 – 14	24 – a – a	11 – a – a
28 – 6	30 – a – a	13 – 12 – a
		81 – a – a

3/6 94

Per ordre

Rath
d. Stadt Lemberg
Ingrossist
[illegible]

5/6

Zahl 21177 ex 1893 ? 5-6-94 13.

Copy genehmigt für die Commission Einlagen Depositen Amt Lemberg am 5/6 1894

Print in Petitum
Zl. f. 15/6

Collandert

[illegible]

No. 216/18

9-6-94

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

189

Endorsement granted to Haridas Sundara Rajanavaru Co- Army Rad Mundi Balakari Sind

in reply to his Petition Registered No. 216/18 dated 2-5-94.

Referring applicant to enquiry of the Deputy Commissioner

Petitioner is informed that referred to the Deputy Commissioner & when orders have been received from the Deputy Commissioner the Enclosures are returned

L-R. 121-93-3

Gen.l Serial No. 3841

1894

No. 537

Name of Petitioner. Gurbanda Gulabchand Patil

Village. Kapileshwar

Taluka. Haveli

District. Poona Collectorate

Date of Arzi. 11-8-94

Date of Receipt. 14-8-94

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. One

ABSTRACT.







1. The Executive Engineer, Tungabhadra Project, Kampli is the Respondent in the Writ Petition.

The Petitioner is not concerned in the Writ Petition.

The humble petition of the undersigned Sankara Lutha Rao, Patel of Rajankalli village, Sandur Taluk, Bellary District, most respectfully sheweth:

That the Petitioner is aggrieved by the decision made on the application (No. 10 of 1993-94) of Sankara Raghavendra Rao of Rajankalli.

2. The following are the Patel-Inam lands registered in the name of the Petitioner for the Patel work of this village

Survey No.	Area	Assessment
63	21-26	Rs. 41--
76	14-14	25--4
82 Part.	8-2	10-8-4

86 Part.	7	7 — —
65	27 - 33	50 — —
84 Part	8 - 32	6 — —
85 Part	19 - 3½	24 — —
7	19 - 18	163 - 8 —

Jade = Rs. 3 - — — Naja = Rs. 32 - 4 — —

3. The Nos. 65, 8 + (part) and 85 (part) went to the share of Raghunatha Rao during the division of the family. — and of these land the petitioner — being the khatedar relinquished No. 65 according to the request of Rasha= vantha Rao. In the remaining six lands are in the name of the petition= er at present. The assessment of the relinquished land is deducted from the total Jodi and there is a reas= sessment Kaya of Rs. 32 - 4 — a light for the landship of the opposite, that is, the petitioner himself ac= cording to the Kaya Rules.

4. There is not to be found any

Government record showing the amount of gold which Raghunatha has to pay as well as the number of lands registered in his name. The assessment of the relinquished land excluded from the gold amount of all the lands in the petitioner's state. Since the petitioner, Raghunatha has not given these details from gross income and has stated that the said assessment is deducted from the gold payable by him which was assigned by himself as to his share. The case has been decided according to his request as he gave wrong information to gain benefit in this case is against the existing rules.

6. The petitioner relinquished the land according to the request of Raghunatha Rao and he considered that the decision shall not be

petitioner on his part because it entitles the ordinary who holds only a two hundred of less assessment to pay a less amount of fees than the petitioners and to enjoy an equal amount of Papa with them who holds lands of more assessment.

6. The enclosed order which directs that the name of Raghunadha Rao khandige be expunged in the register and that the petitioner who is the khatedar should refund the extra amount of money which was drawn from the applicant by the Commissioner's order, has been issued against the pass petitioner claims of fodi and Papa as well as the khata fee. There is not to be found any satisfactory reason to alter the register making changes in khata.

7. In the Patti register neither Raghunadha Rao nor his father's

respects to be found regulated ac-
cordance for the Patel of the village.

8. The petitioner begs to state
that he cried against the evil prac-
tices (just) and 85 (just) which are
existed in the police in the State to
be regulated in Legislative Assem
-bly without Khatedar consent.
Also there is no object of Legislature
Act in the Bhil Patel Act to spoil
power to cause the State to be altered
In respect of this argument the pe-
titioner points para: 2 of Proceedings
No. 3[illegible] 10 — 28. E. 880 in Rev. Manual page
60/33 and 61/34 of 1880 the Proceedings No.
3[illegible]95 — 8½ dated 14th September 1882
and the Circular No. 6 of July 1892 which
decide that the Kaja of the pri-
-ament should be regulated first to
the officials or communication and

me to refund the 23 extra amount mentioned in the order till this case is finally settled.

For these acts of kindness I shall as in duty bound. ever pray for your honor's long life and prosperity.

Begging to be excused for intrusion.

The petitioner begs to remain your Most Obdt. & humble Servant.

Harihar
11th August 1894.

The Copy of the decision No. 10 of 1893-94 is herein enclosed.

11-8-94

the land in question of those that are not the officials cannot be called Swamp Lands.

9. Except the first petitioner humbly begs in addition, to state that your honor will be good enough to take the above fact into your consideration and thereby do the favour of accomplishing his humble request, i.e. to decide ordering Registrar to pay a proper amount of fee he has to have, to keep the State, on the name of the officials petitioned only that is the petitioner disagrees before, to pay the Registrar to the officials, and not to enter the name of Registrar, as, which is the newly introduced being hitherto absent from any State in the Register. Furthermore, I request your honor to send an order to the Dy. Municipal of Swamp not to issue

No. 531

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT,

189

Endorsement granted to Ramaiah Linga Rau Patel of Yelandur, Kanara Dist - Talak.

in reply to his Petition Registered No. 531 dated 1st Aug 1894

praying for a grant of Rs 500 Rupees in aid of ~~[illegible]~~

~~[illegible]~~ the Shanbhog ~~[illegible]~~ Rajkumara Rau

Petitioner is informed that Rs 500 cannot be granted.

The Petn is returned.

L-R-121-93-7

"By Order"

Comr

Secy

7/3/95

for Chief Secretary.

S.K.R. 9/2

M. G. C. P. Bangalore—6-3-94.—2000.

11/12/2

35

(8)

No. 531.